

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 68-80 remain pending in this application. Claims 56-67 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 68-80 have been added.

Priority

Applicants request acknowledgment of the claim for priority and acknowledgment of receipt of the priority document. The priority document was filed with the initial application on August 20, 2003 and is referenced in the Official Filing receipt mailed on November 20, 2003.

Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor for conducting a personal interview with the undersigned and Applicants' representative on April 21, 2006. As stated in the Interview Summary, the Examiner agreed that Applicants' Amendment would require further search and consideration and, if submitted, would overcome the prior art references to Eshel and Nakano. It is submitted that the pending claims include the limitations discussed during the interview. While Applicants maintain that the previously pending claims were patentable over the art of record, the new claims more clearly distinguish the art of record.

Double Patenting Rejection

With respect to the rejection under this section, an Amendment is being submitted in co-pending application 11/201,252 in order to avoid the rejection under this section. The Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned by telephone with any questions.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 56-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eshel et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,535,375) in view of Nakano et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,212). These rejections are traversed as follows.

As mentioned above, during the interview, it was agreed that the rejection under this section would be overcome upon submission of claims discussed during the interview. Such claims are currently pending.

During the interview, it was pointed out to the Examiner that the references do not disclose or suggest a gateway apparatus which receives a first type file access request based on a first type protocol and outputs a second type file access request based on a second type protocol. As such, it is submitted that the pending claims patentably define the present invention over the cited art.

Appl. No. 10/645,813
Amendment dated May 15, 2006
Reply to Office Action of February 13, 2006

ASA-5019

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

By Gene W. Stockman
Shrinath Malur *RN21, p21*
Reg. No. 34,663
(703) 684-1120